

REMARKS

The Office Action of August 7, 1997 and the references cited therein have been carefully considered and, in view of the amendments herein to the claims and the following representations, reconsideration of the application in its present form is respectfully requested.

First, applicant thanks the examiner for the allowance of Claims 3, 4, 10, 25-27, 29, 34 and 35.

However, new Claims 37-44 are similar to these allowed Claims, with changes that the "power control means" is now a "power controller" and the "battery means" is now a "rechargeable DC power source."

With respect to the remaining claims, in view of the amendment herein of Claims 1, 9, 11, 13, 22, 23, 24, 28, 30 and 36, it is respectfully submitted that the claims more particularly point out and distinctly claim the apparatus of the present invention.

New Claims 45-46 describe the rechargeable power source as either a storage battery or a photovoltaic DC power source. In addition, Claim 47 is similar to previously allowed Claim 34 but instead of AC and DC power, there are two DC loads, for the three modes therein.

With respect to the rejections under 35 USC 102(b) based on anticipation and under 35 USC 103 based on obviousness, in view of the amendments herein to Claims 1, 9, 11, 13, 22, 24, 28, 30 and 36, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 4,075,504 of

Gnaedinger, or under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Gnaedinger in view of Peterson should now be withdrawn. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Furthermore, dependent Claims 2, 7, 14-16, 19, 31-33 are now dependent from presumably allowable Claims.

Since the amended Claims now recite that the power control means is a voltage regulating power control means, which converts AC electrical power to voltage regulated DC electrical power, Gnaedinger '504 does not anticipate the claims as amended herein.

The present invention is also sufficiently different to rebut an obviousness rejection as well.

In the present invention, the power control means is a voltage regulating means, which converts AC electrical power to voltage regulated DC electrical power.

There is no such notion in Gnaedinger '504.

In contrast to the present invention, Gnaedinger '504 does not produce voltage regulated DC electrical power.

For example, unlike the present invention, Gnaedinger '504 describes a power supply apparatus for a recreational vehicle which does not filter or voltage regulate the DC power derived from the AC connection.

In contrast to the present invention, Gnaedinger '504 is concerned with the rating of the transformer therein so as to create a priority between the loads L1-L4 and charging the DC battery. In periods of high demand, the battery charging is interrupted.

Also in Gnaedinger '504, the loads L1-L4 can use full wave rectified AC unfiltered (these loads may be incandescent lamps or motor loads, not fluorescent lamps).

Furthermore, in Gnaedinger '504 load L5 is a special load requiring pure DC power which is handled separately.

In addition, in Gnaedinger '504 the battery is disconnected from loads L1-L4 during AC connection by using a relay.

Moreover, in Gnaedinger '504, the circuit is quite inefficient and is not adaptable for high efficiency lighting in offices.

Concerning the prior art of Nakata, Applicant notes that Nakata specifically relates to a system that deals with a DC to AC converting arrangement only, unlike the present invention, and does not deal with the direct coupling a photovoltaic DC power source directly to a DC load, as in the present invention.

Moreover, Peterson is merely cited for a plurality of control units for use with loads in different rooms, which works with both AC and DC electrical power.

The use of only a power control means for converting AC electrical power to voltage regulated DC electrical power, as in the present invention, would be discouraged, if not clearly taught away from the recreational vehicle power supply apparatus of Gnaedinger '504, which is not voltage regulated.

Thus, the present invention is not only not suggested, but would be discouraged or taught away by the Gnaedinger

`504 reference relied on, or upon the combination of Gnaedinger `504 and Peterson, Alenduff, Nakata, Edwards or Kobayashi.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) in view of Gnaedinger `504 or under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Gnaedinger `504 in light of Peterson, Alenduff, Nakata, Edwards or Kobayashi be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 28, 1999  
December 7, 1998



---

Alfred M. Walker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 29,983

225 Old Country Road  
Melville, NY 11747-2712  
(516) 361-8737  
a:#A/pat4-lighting2